



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/766,730	01/22/2001	Claudio L.K. Lins	6289	1305
22922	7590	04/12/2005	EXAMINER	
REINHART BOERNER VAN DEUREN S.C. ATTN: LINDA GABRIEL, DOCKET COORDINATOR 1000 NORTH WATER STREET SUITE 2100 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202			CHORBAIL MONZER R	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1744		
DATE MAILED: 04/12/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/766,730	LINS, CLAUDIO L.K.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MONZER R. CHORBAJI	1744	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 January 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

**This non-final action is in response to the amendment received on 02/01/2005**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

**1.** The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

**2.** The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

**3.** Claims 1-3, 13, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Coffee (U.S.P.N. 6,105,877).

With respect to claims 1 and 15, the Coffee reference discloses a substantially non-aqueous (col.9, lines 61-63) electrostatically dispensable disinfectant composition (20, 23 and 24) that includes an alcohol solvent component and a glycol solute component (col.9, lines 61-63). Also, the Coffee reference teaches adding perfumes (col.4, lines 49-50), which is equivalent to a conductivity control component.

With respect to claim 2, the Coffee reference uses ethanol as the alcohol solvent (col.9, line 62).

With respect to claims 3 and 17, the Coffee reference uses a conductivity control component (col.4, lines 49-50) having a conductivity of about 0.01 microsiemens per centimeter to about 1.0 microsiemens per centimeter (col.4, lines 32-33). Note that the Coffee reference discloses the unit of resistivity as ohmmeter, which is the same as ohm or ohms. The units of ohm and microsiemens are related through reciprocal relation. For example, 0.1 microsiemens/cm = 10 mega ohm-cm, which falls within the range disclosed in the reference.

With respect to claim 13, the Coffee reference teaches a system for electrostatic delivery of an antimicrobial material (figure 9) that includes the following: a disinfectant composition that is electrostatically dispensable (figure 9) including a glycol component (col.9, lines 61-63), an alcohol component (col.9, lines 61-63) and a conductivity control component (col.4, lines 49-50), an electrostatic dispensing apparatus (figure 9) that includes a charging element for charging the composition (24), a voltage source (23) and a dispenser (unlabeled nozzle of 24) for dispensing the charged composition at a rate (col.2, lines 44-49).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coffee (U.S.P.N. 6,105,877) as applied to claims 3 and 1 and further in view of Schroeder et al (U.S.P.N. 5,591,395).

With respect to claims 4-8, the Coffee reference teaches the following: the conductivity control component is perfume (col.4, lines 49-50), 80% ethanol such that if ethanol is volume percent not weight percent then 80% would still fall within the range of claim 7 (col.9, line 62) and a viscosity range of 1 to 500 centipoise (col.4, lines 30-31) for the composition provided by the amount of ethanol present. However, the coffee reference fails to disclose weight percent value for the fragrance and the use of triethylene glycol. The Schroeder reference, which is in the art of disinfecting air, teaches the use of fragrance at 10% weight (example 1) and the use of 10% weight of triethylene glycol (example 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to specifically choose triethylene glycol since it is one of the preferred glycol materials named by the Schroeder reference (col.1, lines 66-67) for its ability to readily generate particles, which form an aerosol

suspension in the air at temperatures, which can safely be used in a small consumer appliance (col.1, lines 62-66).

7. Claims 9-10 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coffee (U.S.P.N. 6,105,877) in view of Schroeder et al (U.S.P.N. 5,591,395) Rabe et al (U.S.P.N. 6,531,142) and Bloch (U.S.P.N. 4,071,616).

With respect to claim 9, the Coffee reference teaches a substantially non-aqueous electrostatically dispensable (20, 23 and 24) disinfectant composition (col.9, lines 62-63) that includes a glycol component with intrinsic initial viscosity and initial conductivity, an alcohol component and a conductivity component (col.4, lines 49-50) having a resistivity range, that falls within the range for the conductivity recited (see explanation with respect to claim 3). Further, the Coffee reference discloses a delivery rate range from 0.1 micro Liter to 500 micro Liter (col.2, lines 45-48) such that upon conversion to grams per hour, the reference delivery rate range values were found to fall within the recited delivery range values. The Coffee reference teaches that a glycol component present at 20 weight percent (col.9, line 63) but fails to provide weight percent as recited in claim 9 for the alcohol component and the conductivity control component. The Schroeder reference uses triethylene glycol (example 2). The Rabe reference teaches adding an amount from 2 weight percent to 90 weight percent of ethanol (col.5, lines 14-16 and line 49). The Bloch reference teaches that the weight percent range for perfume is from 0.25 weight percent to 30 weight percent (col.1, lines 61-62). As a result, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the composition of the Coffee reference to

include to include triethylene glycol because of its ability to readily generate an aerosol suspension in the air at safe temperatures for small consumer applications (col.1, lines 62-66) and to include ethanol component in an amount between 2 to 90 weight percent since ethanol is a solvent used for concentration makeup and to increase the amount of perfume present in order to release the perfume with a sufficient level so as to be considered satisfactory air freshener.

With respect to claim 22, the Coffee reference teaches a substantially non-aqueous electrostatically dispensable (20, 23 and 24) disinfectant composition (col.9, lines 62-63) that includes a glycol component with intrinsic initial viscosity and initial conductivity, an alcohol component and a conductivity component (col.4, lines 49-50) having a resistivity range, that falls within the range for the conductivity recited (see explanation with respect to claim 3). Further, the Coffee reference discloses a delivery rate range from 0.1 micro Liter to 500 micro Liter (col.2, lines 45-48) such that upon conversion to grams per hour, the reference delivery rate range values were found to fall within the recited delivery range values. The Coffee reference teaches that a glycol component present at 20 weight percent (col.9, line 63) but fails to provide weight percent as recited in claim 22 for triethylene glycol, the alcohol component and the fragrance component. The Schroeder reference uses triethylene glycol at about 10 weight percent (example 2). The Rabe reference teaches adding an amount from 2 weight percent to 90 weight percent of ethanol (col.5, lines 14-16 and line 49). The Bloch reference teaches that the weight percent range for perfume is from 0.25 weight percent to 30 weight percent (col.1, lines 61-62). As a result, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the composition of the Coffee reference to include to include triethylene glycol at about 10 weight percent for generating lower number of particles compared to dipropylene glycol at 90 weight percent in example 1 and to include ethanol component in an amount between 2 to 90 weight percent since ethanol is a solvent used for concentration makeup and to increase the amount of perfume present in order to release the perfume with a sufficient level so as to be considered satisfactory air freshener.

With respect to claim 10, the Coffee reference teaches including ethanol and polyethylene glycol in the composition (col.9, lines 62-63). In addition, the Coffee reference discloses a viscosity range of 1 to 500 centipoise (col.4, lines 30-31) for the composition. However, the Coffee reference fails to specifically teach using triethylene glycol. The Schroeder reference discloses the use of triethylene glycol (example 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Coffee reference by substituting polyethylene glycol for triethylene glycol since it is one of the preferred glycol materials named by the Schroeder reference (col.1, lines 66-67) for its ability to readily generate particles, which form an aerosol suspension in the air at temperatures, which can safely be used in a small consumer appliance (col.1, lines 62-66).

With respect to claim 23, the Coffee reference teaches a composition that includes ethanol (col.9, line 62) and fragrance (col.4, lines 49-50). Further, the Coffee reference discloses a delivery rate range from 0.1 micro Liter to 500 micro Liter (col.2,

lines 45-48) such that upon conversion to grams per hour, the reference delivery rate range values were found to fall within the recited delivery range values.

With respect to claim 24, the coffee reference discloses a composition that includes polyethylene glycol, ethanol and fragrance, but fails to teach the following: the use of triethylene glycol, ethanol at about 56 weight percent and fragrance at about 30 weight percent; however, the Schroeder reference uses triethylene glycol in weight percent range from 5% to 100% (col.2, lines 15-19) because of its ability to readily generate an aerosol suspension in the air at safe temperatures for small consumer applications (col.1, lines 62-66), the Rabe reference teaches adding an amount from 2 weight percent to 90 weight percent of ethanol (col.5, lines 14-16 and line 49) such a modification is a matter of routine experimentation and the Bloch reference teaches that the weight percent range for perfume is from 0.25 weight percent to 30 weight percent (col.1, lines 61-62) such that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the composition of the Coffee reference by increasing the amount of perfume present in order to release the perfume with a sufficient level so as to be considered satisfactory air freshener as taught by the Bloch reference (col.3, lines 50-52).

8. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coffee (U.S.P.N. 6,105,877) in view of Schroeder et al (U.S.P.N. 5,591,395), Rabe et al (U.S.P.N. 6,531,142) and Bloch (U.S.P.N. 4,071,616) as applied to claim 9 and further in view of Peltier (U.S.P.N. 5,382,410).

With respect to claim 11-12, the Coffee reference, the Schroeder reference, the Rabe reference and the Bloch reference all fail to teach the use of essential oils. However, with respect to claims 11-12, the Peltier reference, which is in the art of electrostatically generating aerosols, teaches the use of essential oils (col.1, lines 45-48). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the composition of the Coffee reference by substituting perfumes for essential oils since essential oils are known for odorizing air as taught by the Peltier reference (col.10, lines 42-45).

9. Claim 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coffee (U.S.P.N. 6,105,877) view of Schroeder et al (U.S.P.N. 5,591,395).

With respect to claim18, the Coffee reference teaches a method of using a glycol to reduce airborne microbial levels (col.4, lines 13-14, the use of biocide at some level would reduce airborne microbial levels regardless of the intended use) that includes the following: providing an electrostatically dispensable composition (figure 9) including a glycol component (col.9, lines 61-63), charging element for charging the composition (24) including an electrode (unlabeled connector between 23 and 24 in figure 9) connected to a voltage source (23) and a dispenser (unlabeled nozzle of 24) for dispensing the charged composition at a rate (col.2, lines 44-49). However, the Coffee reference fails to teach effecting a 3-log reduction in airborne microbial levels. The Schroeder reference teaches that the composition causes a reduction of 3-log in the airborne microbial levels (Examples 1-2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Coffee

reference by choosing triethylene glycol since it causes a substantial reduction in the amount of airborne bacteria present as taught by the Schroeder reference (col.4, lines 10-17).

With respect to claim 19, the Schroeder reference teaches using triethylene glycol (example 2).

With respect to claim 20, the Coffee reference discloses a delivery rate range from 0.1 micro Liter to 500 micro Liter (col.2, lines 45-48) such that upon conversion to grams per hour, the reference delivery rate range values were found to fall within the recited delivery range values. In addition, the Coffee reference teaches a composition that includes polyethylene glycol, but fails to teach the use of triethylene glycol; however, the Schroeder reference teaches using triethylene glycol (example 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Coffee reference by substituting polyethylene glycol for triethylene glycol since it is one of the preferred glycol materials named by the Schroeder reference (col.1, lines 66-67) for its ability to readily generate particles, which form an aerosol suspension in the air at temperatures, which can safely be used in a small consumer appliance (col.1, lines 62-66).

With respect to claim 21, the Coffee reference discloses the use of a polyethylene glycol (col.9, lines 62-63) that includes fragrance, i.e., a conductivity control component (col.4, lines 49-50) and for providing a conductivity of about 0.01 microsiemens per centimeter to about 1.0 microsiemens per centimeter as have previously been explained regarding claims 3 and 17.

10. Claims 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coffee (U.S.P.N. 6,105,877) as applied to claims 13 and 15 respectively and further in view of Schroeder et al (U.S.P.N. 5,591,395).

With respect to claim 14, the Schroeder reference teaches that the composition is delivered in an amount to cause a reduction of 3-log in the airborne microbial levels (Examples 1-2).

With respect to claim 16, the Coffee reference discloses a delivery rate range from 0.1 micro Liter to 500 micro Liter (col.2, lines 45-48) such that upon conversion to grams per hour, the reference delivery rate range values were found to fall within the recited delivery range values. In addition, the Coffee reference teaches a composition that includes polyethylene glycol, but fails to teach the use of triethylene glycol; however, the Schroeder reference teaches using triethylene glycol (example 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Coffee reference by substituting polyethylene glycol for triethylene glycol since it is one of the preferred glycol materials named by the Schroeder reference (col.1, lines 66-67) for its ability to readily generate particles, which form an aerosol suspension in the air at temperatures, which can safely be used in a small consumer appliance (col.1, lines 62-66).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

On page 9 of the Remarks, applicant argues that, "Coffee does not disclose or discuss use of the device with a substantially non-aqueous disinfection composition or use of the device to reduce airborne microbial levels." The examiner disagrees. The word "substantially" means being largely but not wholly, meaning the composition includes small amounts of water. The specification on page 3, lines 1-4, teaches that an aqueous component, i.e., component dissolved in water can be included as long as it does not affect the goals and objectives of the invention. The Coffee reference recognizes that water negatively affects the electrostatic dispersion of the device by not establish a practical drag pressure (col.8, lines 9-12) and provides a composition in column 9, lines 62-63 that does not include any water. Also, see page 4, lines 17-18 where the weight or volume percent of aqueous component of azeotropes are contemplated. Further, the Coffee reference teaches including biocides in the composition (col.4, line 14), which eliminate microorganisms in the air when electrostatically dispersed by the device.

On page 9 of the Remarks, applicant argues that, "Coffee does not define or place any limit on the compositional make-up of the recited perfume and aroma liquids." The examiner disagrees. In col.4, lines 30-33, the Coffee reference places a constraint on any liquid to be dispersed by the device including fragrances by including certain sensitivities and viscosities values. The specification on pages 4-5 provides examples of fragrances and teaches that such fragrances are not limited to the provided examples. Further, the specification on pages 4-5 teaches that any fragrance present between 10 weight percent to 90 weight percent provides the proper conductivity and is considered

a conductivity control component. Since the Coffee reference teaches using fragrance (col.4, lines 49-50) with resistivity and conductivity values that falls within the recited values in the instant claims, then the fragrance in the Coffee reference is equivalent to a conductivity control component.

On page 10 of the Remarks, applicant argues that, "However, no suggestion as to how to control receptivity/conductivity of the practicable liquids is provided or contemplated." The examiner disagrees. The Coffee reference (col.4, lines 30-33) places constraints on the liquids to be used by the device by providing specific ranges for conductivity and resistivity values. Thus, the Coffee reference does control the conductivity and resistivity of liquids dispersed by the device. Note that the Coffee reference discloses the unit of resistivity as ohmmeter, which is the same as ohm or ohms. The units of ohm and microsiemens (conductivity) are related through reciprocal relation. For example, 0.1 microsiemens/cm = 10 mega ohm-cm, which falls within the range disclosed in the reference.

On page 10 of the Remarks, applicant argues that, "Moreover, there is not discussion or teaching to ethanol/PEG composition with the perfumes or aromas described in column 4." The examiner disagrees. The Coffee reference in col.9, lines 62-63 provides an exemplary experiment where a composition including ethanol and PEG are used and further teaches in column 4, lines 49-50 that fragrance can be included in the composition for dispensing. The Coffee reference does not teach not to include fragrance with a composition having ethanol and PEG as its components. As a matter of fact, the Coffee reference teaches that any liquid can be used in the device as

long as the liquid has certain conductivity and resistivity values. The combination of using ethanol, polyethylene glycol and fragrance is within the teachings of the Coffee reference.

On pages 11-12 of the Remarks, applicant argues that, "In particular, the Coffee and Schroeder embody divergent liquid dispersion devices, utilizing substantially different methods of aerosol generation for substantially different purposes." Both references are in the same art, which is disinfecting air and have the same purpose. The Schroeder reference is combined with the Coffee reference for using fragrance at the recited range in the instant claims and for specifically using triethylene glycol.

On page 12 of the Remarks, applicant argues that, "No motivation is provided in Coffee to turn to indirect heating devices to uncover additional suitable liquids for use in an electrohydrodynamic spray device." The coffee reference does not exclude any liquid from being used in the device as long as the liquid has certain conductivity and resistivity values. The motivation of combining reference is found in the art (the Schroeder reference) for specifically using triethylene glycol. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the composition of the Coffee reference by substituting polyethylene glycol for triethylene glycol since it is one of the preferred glycol materials named by the Schroeder reference (col.1, lines 66-67) for its ability to readily generate particles, which form an aerosol suspension in the air at temperatures, which can safely be used in a small consumer appliance (col.1, lines 62-66).

On page 12 of the Remarks, applicant argues that, "Applicant notes that there is no disclosure in Schroeder of a conductivity control component." The limitation for conductivity control component is addressed in the Coffee reference. The Schroeder reference is combined for weight percent of fragrance and for using triethylene glycol, and not for the conductivity control component feature.

On page 13 of the Remarks, applicant argues that, "Further, Schroeder fails to teach weight percentages values for an alcohol component clearly no such component is contemplated by the Schroeder reference." The limitation for weight percentages values for an alcohol component is addressed in both the Coffee reference and the newly applied Rabe reference. The Schroeder reference is combined for weight percent of fragrance and for using triethylene glycol, and not for weight percentages values for an alcohol component.

The Tsuchiya reference has been withdrawn and replaced with the newly applied reference Rabe et al (U.S.P.N. 6,531,142), which is in the art of designing compositions used in electrostatic delivery devices. The composition includes ethanol, glycol component and fragrance.

On page 14 of the Remarks, applicant argues that, "Bloch describes yet another genre of compositions, wholly different from the compositions discussed above." The Bloch and the Coffee reference are both in the art of air treatment. The Bloch reference is combined with the Coffee reference for the fragrance weight percent limitation recited in claims 9 and 22 and not for conductivity control component or alcohol component. Such limitations are found in the Coffee reference. Clearly, it would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to increase the amount of perfume present in order to release the perfume with a sufficient level so as to be considered satisfactory air freshener as taught by the Bloch reference (col.3, lines 50-52).

On page 17 of the Remarks, applicant argues that, "Coffee does not teach or describe use of charged glycol air sanitizing compositions". The claims do not recite such a limitation. However, with respect to "charged" components, the Coffee reference teaches dispensing components with a net charge that is neutral, positive or negative (col.3, lines 20-22).

### ***Conclusion***

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The EP 0 520 547 A2 reference discloses a composition where the concentration of ethanol is about 50 weight percent along with a glycol component.
13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MONZER R. CHORBAJI whose telephone number is (571) 272-1271. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-3:00.
14. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN KIM can be reached on (571) 272-1142. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Monzer R. Chorbaji *MRC*  
Patent Examiner  
AU 1744  
03/30/2005

*John Kim*  
JOHN KIM  
SUPERVISORY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1700